



Draft Meeting Minutes

Active Shooter Initiative (ASI)

Wednesday, March 30, 2016, 11 am – 1 pm US, EDT

WebEx Virtual Meeting

	Item
1.	<p>Welcome and Call to Order</p> <p>Dr. Marc Siegel (ASIS) called the meeting to order at approximately 11:06 am. He and Mr. Robert Solomon (NFPA) welcomed attendees and thanked all for their participation.</p>
2.	<p>Approval of the Agenda</p> <p>Dr. Siegel called for any proposed modifications to the draft agenda, and there being none, the agenda was approved as circulated.</p>
3.	<p>Approval of the January 19, 2016 Meeting Minutes</p> <p>Dr. Siegel called for any modifications to the draft minutes of the January 19th meeting, and there being none, the minutes were approved as circulated.</p>
4.	<p>Feedback from Last Meeting</p> <p>Dr. Siegel informed that very positive feedback was received from the January meeting. It was noted numerous reference documents were provided, and that strong views were expressed to maintain the momentum of this initiative. Dr. Siegel explained that to further collaborate and generate ideas, an online public community platform has been created in order to facilitate the interaction and discussion among this group's membership and where additional documents can be shared. Individuals are encouraged to utilize this tool as much as possible. Ms. Opicka provided a brief presentation on how to access the online community. She emphasized the need to create an ASIS Contact ID record to access the discussion board.</p> <p>Discussion ensued regarding the feedback and expressed need for a document to address what to do before, during, and after an incident. Issues expressed included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Should there be some level of detail pertaining to equipment/hardware;• Should the document be divided into management, product, and interactions with law enforcement etc.;• Where is the line between Active Shooter and Terrorism; and• Inconsistencies between life safety codes and security best practices. <p>Ultimately it was agreed that the document would need to revisit the issues between life safety codes and security best practices so as to develop complimentary solutions.</p> <p>Dr. Siegel recommended a group be formed to develop a <i>Crosswalk</i> that would look at existing materials and identify issues that need to be addressed as part of this initiative. The group agreed and it was noted that to ensure a balance of interests/representation, individuals will be asked to indicate which group they wish to represent--life safety codes or security. Ms. Opicka informed that ASIS will send a <i>Call for Participation</i> and will compile the results for further follow-up.</p> <p>Additionally, concerns were expressed regarding end-user resource limitations—specifically, aspects of potential development of hard/rigid requirements in a standard versus a guideline document of some type. Challenges for the standard model include certifying to the standard, time and potential lack of funding for organizations; its important that the document be scalable for implementation purposes, and provide “free” steps so that organizations can demonstrate duty of care.</p>

In moving forward, it was also recommended that consideration be given to developing a maturity model document so that organizations can implement recommendations within a phased approach based on available resources as well as complexity of the environment.

Action:

- ASIS to send a *Call for Participation* for the Crosswalk Development Group with options for members to choose between Life Safety Codes and Security Best Practices.

5. Terminology

The group moved to discuss the term "Active Shooter" and if consideration should be given to changing the name of the initiative to (for example), "Active Assailant", "Active Threat", "Hostile or Violent Assailant".

It was noted that the term "Active Assailant" would more broadly cover all measure of threats (not just gun-related incidents), and it would keep the inseparable relations between workplace violence and active shooter. However, it was also argued that while events are not just gun-related, the term "Active Shooter" is widely known and accepted.

Identifying the scope of the definition of the term was noted as another step that needs to be considered in these discussion. Whichever term is used; it needs to address more inclusively the different types of threats/assailants. It was also recommended to first frame the definition as appropriate to this initiative, and then determine which term fits best. For now, it was agreed to review existing reference materials and keep the current term to avoid reinventing the wheel.

To obtain as much feedback as possible, it was noted the following categories will be set up in the Online Community platform:

- Term (what term should be used to describe this initiative)
- Definition (define the term that should be used)
- Scope (what breadth of consideration should be given based on the definition).
 - Consider time based framework - what considerations are managed before, during and after an event. In other words, what measures fall into the preparation, response and information (during) categories.
- After Action Reports (assimilation, communication to occupants and external contacts)
- Types of assaults (that should be considered)
- Types of events that fall under active shooter
- Types of events that fall under "other" types of events
- Types of events that are inseparable when considering Active Shooter and Workplace Violence.

Action:

- ASIS Members to provide feedback to the definition and other categories via the Online Community platform through April 30, 2016.

6. Discussion of reference documentation

Dr. Siegel briefly discussed potential options for moving forward based on the feedback from the January meeting. He informed of potential options for document development and provided a brief overview of the difference between a standard, guideline, as well as types of standards (e.g. requirements with "shall language" or guidance with "should" language). It was mentioned that the type of document will be a key factor in this initiative, therefore comments and recommendations are welcome and encouraged.

7. Next Steps

Dr. Siegel recommended another meeting be scheduled for May 2016 so as to review the feedback on the discussion board.

8. Next Meeting

Next meeting date to be determined (TBD). Potential dates will be sent to the group to determine best availability.

9. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at approximately 12:45 pm.